



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

84
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,006	03/28/2002	Alexander Pilger	1454.1124	7148
21171	7590	07/25/2006	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005				AVELLINO, JOSEPH E
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2143		

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/018,006 Examiner Joseph E. Avellino	PILGER ET AL. Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 June 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7-11 and 13-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-11 and 13-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 7-11, 13-16 are presented for examination; claim 7 independent. The Office acknowledges the cancellation of claims 12 and 17.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 7-11, and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fijolek et al. (USPN 6,223,222) (hereinafter Fijolek).

3. Referring to claim 7, Fijolek discloses a communication system utilizing a network (Figure 1), comprising:

a user computer (i.e. CPE 18) connected to the network 14 (Figure 1) including an access unit (i.e. Cable Modem 16) which determines predetermined QoS features for interaction with the network (i.e. requests a particular QoS, and performs the communication at the acquired QoS) (e.g. abstract; Figure 18; col. 29, line 55 to col. 30, line 7); and

a service provider computer (i.e. QoS Server 332) connected to the network 14 (Figure 1), to enable the QoS features of the access unit (i.e. provide a QoS identifier to the cable modem to perform communications at the requested CoS and rate) (Figures 18 and 27; col. 29, line 55 to col. 30, line 7; col. 36, lines 44-61); and

a database, connected to the service provider computer, to determine which of the predetermined QoS features (i.e. identifiers) are currently permissible for the user computer (i.e. what identifiers are currently used for each indication of CoS, QoS and other related parameters requested by the modem (col. 29, line 55 to col. 30, line 5).

4. Referring to claim 8, Fijolek discloses the network is the Internet (i.e. data net 28) (Figure 1).

5. Referring to claim 9, Fijolek discloses the access unit is an autonomous device (i.e. a cable modem is considered an autonomous device) (Figure 1, col. 6, lines 30-35).

6. Referring to claim 10, Fijolek discloses the access unit is a plug-in device for the first computer (the Office takes the term “plug-in device” to be broadly construed as “a device which can be physically or logically connected to a computer” such as the cable modem can be “plugged into” the CPE 20 via an Ethernet cable) (Figure 1).

7. Referring to claim 11, Fijolek discloses the access unit is a processor of the first computer programmed to determine predetermined QoS features for interaction with the network (i.e. since the interface device acts on behalf of the first computer, it can be considered that the interface access device processor is a processor of the first computer since without the interface, the first computer would be unable to access the network (col. 29, line 55 to col. 30, line 5).

8. Referring to claim 13, Fijolek discloses the QoS computer is assigned to an ISP (i.e. data over cable system 330 is part of the ISP network) (col. 29, line 55 to col. 30, line 5).

9. Referring to claim 14, Fijolek discloses the QoS features are called up dynamically in the access unit (the Office takes the term “called up” as created) (col. 5, lines 56-67).

10. Referring to claim 15, Fijolek discloses the access unit (i.e. cable modem) converts from a first protocol (i.e. Ethernet connecting the cable modem with the CPE 20) to a second protocol (i.e. the protocol used to transfer data over a cable network, commonly known as DOCSIS) (col. 6, lines 30-35).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fijolek.

12. Fijolek discloses the invention substantively as described in claim 7. Fijolek inherently requires that the access unit is incapable of operation without additional

components (i.e. a power cord to provide power to the modem, as well as data cables to connect various components to the modem). Fijolek does not specifically state that the cable modem is an integral component to the user computer, however it has been held obvious to make parts integral. See *In re Larson* 144 USPQ 347 (CCPA 1965). By this rationale, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Fijolek to provide the cable modem as a part of the computer, thereby reducing the number of components the user computer requires to access the network.

Response to Arguments

13. Applicant's arguments, dated June 22, 2006 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

16. Applicant employs broad language, which includes the use of word, and phrases, which have broad meanings in the art. In addition, Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim language, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. As the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is forced to interpret the claim limitations as broadly and as reasonably possible, in determining patentability of the disclosed invention. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir.1993). Failure for Applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims with scope parallel to the Applicant in the response, and reiterates the need for the Applicant to more clearly and distinctly, define the claimed invention.


Art Unit: 2143

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph E. Avellino whose telephone number is (571) 272-3905. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JEA
July 11, 2006


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100